

grouping of claims. Thus, the amendments in response to the initial examination opinion did not alter the nature of either group of claims or the nature of any distinction between them.

Since (a) both the method and apparatus groups of claims have already been searched and examined and (b) the amendment itself did not necessitate the restriction, no adequate basis is apparent for insisting upon restriction. Although the method and apparatus claims have different classifications, the classifications have not changed since the search was conducted. No search locations beyond those already searched need to be consulted to continue with the examination of all of the pending claims.

### Telephone Interview

Examiner Richman was consulted by telephone today concerning the restriction requirement. The Examiner did not recall from a mere identification of the case any special circumstances that would have warranted the restriction between already examined claims.

\* \* \*

Reconsideration of the restriction between method claims 1-6 and apparatus claims 7-29 is respectfully requested. Allowance of all of these claims is also respectfully requested in view of applicants' response to the prior Office Action.

For any question on this or the application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
EUGENE STEPHENS & ASSOCIATES



Thomas B. Ryan, Reg. No. 31,659  
Agent for Applicant(s)  
56 Windsor Street  
Rochester, New York 14605  
Phone: (585) 232-7700  
Facsimile: (585) 232-7188  
TBR:cba  
Dated: 22 November 2002

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on the date shown below with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C., 20231.

Date of Deposit: 22 November 2002

Signature: 